DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 410 346 UD 031 839

AUTHOR	Emanuelsson, Ingemar
TITLE	Integration and Segregation: Inclusion and Exclusion.
PUB DATE	Mar 97
NOTE	15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Disabilities; *Diversity (Student); Educational Research; Educational Theories; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Inclusive Schools; Mainstreaming; *Regular and Special Education Relationship; *School Segregation; *Special Education; Student Placement
IDENTIFIERS	*Sweden

ABSTRACT

In considering what to do with the normally existing diversity in a group of children coming to a school intended for all, the concepts of integration, segregation, inclusion, and exclusion must be considered as characteristics of school aims, organization, and work. Questions related to these concepts are particularly pertinent in a discussion of special education. In the context of the Swedish schools, which are meant to be "one school for all" by parliamentary mandate, the question should be why anyone should be excluded or segregated. Regarding the issues in this light, rather than considering why someone should be included, would make the challenges for regular and special education much clearer. If real integration is the aim, then the challenge becomes accepting more diversity. Diversity in learning abilities should be regarded as something positive and valuable, rather than something to eliminate. Looking at integration in this light will mean challenges for educational research as well, since it will become more important to examine integration processes than to study bases for exclusion. It will be necessary to stop talking of integration as a method or measure and to stop referring to individuals as "integrated." Some results of a longitudinal study in Sweden show a picture of successful integration into school and later into the workforce for a group of low-ability students included in mainstream classrooms who were never designated "integrated," but who were merely included. Study of the processes that made this happen will be more useful than theorizing about inclusion. (Contains 22 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 410 346

INTEGRATION AND SEGREGATION
–
INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION

Paper presented at the 1997 Annual AERA Meeting
Chicago, Illinois, March 24 – 28, 1997

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ingemar Emanuelsson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Ingemar Emanuelsson
Göteborg university
Department of Education and Educational Research
P.O. Box 1010
S–431 26 Mölndal SWEDEN
E-mail Ingemar.Emanuelsson@ped.gu.se

UD031839

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Presented at 28.42:
"Crossing Borders: Learning from Inclusion and Restructuring Research in Sweden Denmark, Norway , and The US.

Integration and segregation – inclusion and exclusion

The heading of this paper consists of four concepts, all of which are more or less intensively under debate for a lot of reasons. They all have in common, that they are related to ideology and policies. Not least that is the case, when they are dealt with in connection with special education, even if they are – or certainly should – be understood as regular educational concepts rather than just special educational ones. The real meaning of integration as well as inclusion in such relations is best understood as goals or aims based on ideology and understandings of democracy, if you in this latter concept include issues like everyone being of equal value, rights of everybody to partake in common activities in a society and so forth. So understood, integration and inclusion ought to be seen as challenges, first hand to what is often called "normal" or "regular" in societies. In that sense they are important challenges everywhere and in almost all activities going on in society. This is important as well as true, even if, in this paper, I will concentrate on issues in education and schools – the nine year (ages 6/7 – 9) comprehensive and obligatory 'grundskola' and upper secondary school – officially voluntary but in reality today almost obligatory. Another restriction will be made, as I take my standpoints from a Scandinavian – not to say Swedish – perspectives in my presentation and discussions.

All the four concepts have in common a meaning based on recognised diversity. Students differ in most preconditions for learning and other characteristics of importance for partaking in school activities. Diversity, though, is not enough for giving significant meaning to the concepts. This is due to the very fact, that diversity as such is an important quality of what is "normal". It may be a tacit dream for some teachers to meet a school class, homogeneous in the sense that all the students are very similar in most relevant preconditions. But this extremely odd happening should be impossible to reach. Normality in grouping is instead characterised by diversity. Diversity as such, then, has very little to contribute to the understanding of integration – segregation and/or inclusion – exclusion in terms of ideology, policies, challenges and aims etc. Due to do the fact, that diversity almost never is just noted or recognised but also ground for value definitions, the real meaning of the concepts and challenges becomes more complex. Differences between individuals – not least between children and youngsters in the transforming processes of being fostered to pupils (students) in schools – are also given certain values. Some differences are valued as positive or good, others negative or bad etc. In this sense you usually talk about deviancy, a concept which is more likely to be connected with the so called negative part of the normal distribution of experienced – measured or estimated – characteristics. Especially, differences in highly valued aspects are in greatest risks of being devalued as deviances. As a rule such values become bound to individuals, so called deviant ones, labelled as

students with disabilities, learning disabled, handicapped, students with special needs etc. (Emanuelsson & Persson, 1997).

Integration as a goal and an aim is, as well as inclusion, ideologically founded on views of man and democracy. Everyone is said to be of equal value, and therefore important as a member of and a resource within a group or in society. Prerequisites differ between individuals, but this is the normal condition for human togetherness and not anything sick or deviant in itself. The challenging question is, how much of normally existing diversity members are prepared to accept in regular groups and activities.

The real meaning of the concepts are then given in answers to the question: "What to do with the normally existing diversity within the group of children coming to 'a school for all'"? If this question is dealt with and answered in terms of deviancy, then also meaning is given to the concepts of integration/segregation and inclusive/exclusive as characteristics of school aims, organisation and work. Are they including and integrating or segregating and excluding? This is a demanding question, basic for understanding of what kind of problems and challenges that are defined and dealt with. Answers are often given from a perspective determined by already given labels on individual deviancy characteristics, and then also these kinds of values and norms give the foundation for how far participation is judged possible, also for in that way labelled students (cf. Skidmore, 1996).

But – why should the judgements and questions be put from that kind of deviancy, and therefore exclusive perspective? How much is this due to a traditional special education way of understanding and acting? These are challenging questions to be put in special education practise as well as research. What kind of roles do special educators take, or accept as given in schools? This means then to problematise the relations between diversity and deviance, and to identify different system positions, professions etc. with power to take defining decisions. A consequence of seeing problems originated just in individual shortcomings or bad individual-bound preconditions – the psycho-medical paradigm according to Skidmore (1996) – tends to be segregation and/or exclusion. Should it not be more reasonable and more in agreement with the 'one school for all' principle – decided upon by the Swedish parliament – to raise questions the other way around: Why should someone be segregated or excluded? This would make the challenges much more clear and straight-forward, and also help to put the responsibility for consequences of given answers on the determiners and their motives. It would also help to get better understanding of what is the real meaning of integration and inclusion as contrasting concepts to segregation and exclusion.

To give motives and reasons for segregation and/or exclusion – judged as necessary – would be more demanding for explicit value-based expressions and reasons. This would also mean, that the motives would be more clearly anchored in the preconditions for partaking in regular educational activities, and therefore more illuminating for the preparedness – or its

contrast – to meet diversity by reconstructing what is thought of as normal, trying to make regular (normal) activities more inclusive by diminishing needs for exclusion. This is, as far as I understand, a very similar way of putting questions as Thomas Skritc (1991) does in the book "Behind special education?", may be with a slight editorial change: What's behind the need for a segregated special education taking care of students excluded from regular education? What in fact is behind, then, ought to be motivated from the point of view, that comprehensiveness and inclusion are decided upon as guidelines and rules for that very same regular education. Recent reports from ongoing studies on these matters (Persson, 1995; Emanuelsson & Persson, 1997) tell, that this way of presenting reasons for more or less segregated special education measures against students are very scarce in today's Swedish schools. A demanding fact is, that there is too little research elucidating this perspective on integration and inclusion done, too, in Sweden as well as in many other countries (e.g. Haug, 1995; Hegarty, 1991, 1993; Skidmore, 1996). Just started, though, is a research project aiming at investigations of processes on political, administrative, personnel, as well as parent and student levels leading to define diversity of preconditions as deviancy and needs for special more or less segregated measures (Emanuelsson, 1996).

So far I have used the two concepts integration and inclusion more or less synonomic, but, for sure, they are not. Related to a democracy based societal goal such as the Swedish expression 'a school for all' they certainly have qualities in common. They may in that sense be said to have the same roots and back-ground in the history of special education and handicap. There are differences, though, even if inclusion in many cases can be seen as a successor of integration. Partly, according to my understanding, as a consequence of a misuse of integration, which have destroyed the concept as a denomination for the ideologically based and also semantic meaning of keeping or making something whole and well melted together. I am well aware of, that there have been, and still are, a lot of debates about which concept is deeper rooted in ideology and so forth, but I will not go into detail on these matters here. I just can see, that in English language, and especially in the UK and the US, the concept 'inclusion' is the one to use today, and that it also is seen as a positive change in relation to ideology foundation, when integration as an aim developed into inclusion. May be, that in Scandinavia, this will not be so to the same extent, and one reason for this, I think, is connected to languages as such: 'inkluderande undervisning' just does not taste good in your mouth when you say it. But, in Sweden, like in other parts of the world, we have faced the same problem with a very careless use of the concept 'integration'. This misuse has lead to many unlucky consequences, not least for those who face difficulties in school situations.

The concept of integration has been misused and/or used very carelessly in many respects. There are many reasons for this (Emanuelsson, 1995). Without going into detail on these here, let me just say, that it often has caused confusion and that it has been unfortunate for policies related to the concept in several ways. I claim it is of greatest importance to be very clear

on what you mean by using the concept integration in relation to what is going to happen to people with e.g. disabilities or impediments in school and society.

The ideological meaning of integration, in its deeper sense, is a goal or from democratic ideals a wanted and wishful state of the arts. The concept can also be understood as a quality aspect of development processes - as contrast to segregation - aimed to lead to such goals. Integration as a concept, then, in relation to disabilities, handicap etc. has very little to do with what should be done with or for a certain so-called deviating person, but instead with what has to be done in environments and common togetherness in order to make normally existing differences in preconditions between individuals accepted as normal. In this sense I think that integration is even more challenging and demanding for reconstruction of regular education than inclusion.

Further on in this paper I present more of reflections on research on integration than results from certain research projects - even if I will refer to some aspects from ongoing research projects at the end. I will plead for a more precise and careful use of the concept integration, and above all a more careful and critical interpretation of results from studies on, and experiences of so called integration endeavours. In fact, most often mainstreaming – in its original meaning: to put into the main-stream – is often a more justifying describing concept of what is really studied. I will point to some very serious misunderstandings resulting from a wrong or un-precise way of using the concept integration. First of all this may have unfortunate consequences for pupils with different kinds of diagnosed impairments or deviant characteristics. Especially so, for their possibilities to take part in every day normal activities as recognised members, and in a more complete sense really belonging members, of the so called normal society.

Integration means challenges. It is therefore very important that the challenges are put on the right places and situations, and on persons responsible for development of better possibilities for full and whole partaking for all members of society, as e. g. in school classes. In such environments the conditions for integration are created and developed, or hampered by segregating policies and processes. However, the latter are often left undiscovered and/or un-tackled, sometimes even more or less consciously hidden.

Let me take a simple but illustrative example. Often, and I think too often, you still hear a description of a school-class running like this: "In our class we are 25 students, and then we have *one integrated*". What is the real and deep meaning of such a description? For how long is a certain individual supposed to be labelled the one "integrated"? This is just an illustration of the fact, that integration in its real and deeper sense has not taken place at all or developed very far. If nothing else happens in and with the group than just adding a 'deviant' person, it is easy to understand, that this person may very well be just as isolated and/or segregated within the group as

outside, placed in a special group or in a special school. He/she is really *not partaking*. But what are *then* the reasons, and where can you find them, for the unsuccessful integration and the very restricted partaking in such a situation? In accordance with this way of thinking and with the illustrated understanding of integration, the reasons are very often laid "one-sided" upon the deviant individual and his characteristics. Often expressed in terms of certain kinds of *"handicap"* or in specified amounts of severeness of the *"handicap"* - characteristics of the one who is diagnosed or judged to have "special needs". She/he is thought of as being the problem. But this is a misinterpretation of the challenges of integration. You must also, and primarily, look for reasons in the group where integration was aimed to develop, e.g. in its way of working, patterns of giving values to certain characteristics, and in other conditions for its togetherness. Such conditions, in turn, form the frame for wanted and/or possible partaking for persons in need of special help and support, sometimes called users of special needs support.

The comprehensive school is as a rule said to be a school for all. This means, then, that it shall include, as far as possible, all children in the sense, that everybody shall meet optimal development and learning conditions in the same school, that is as fully recognised members of the togetherness. This is one part of the comprehensiveness of the school. Such expressed inclusive aims presuppose development of integration as a main goal for the regular education taking place in that school.

Some historical aspects.

A traditional school way of reacting to diversity in student preconditions is to define "boarder values" in different abilities and/or preconditions in order to get more homogeneous groups. This is thought of as giving more effective, but also more comfortable and suitable teaching situations. Pupils falling outside such boarders are seen as in need of special education etc., but *also* considered as causing too much disturbances, hampers etc. That is, *diversity is transformed into deviancy*. Therefore some students are looked upon as risk factors wished to get rid of (Emanuelsson, 1994a and b) according to what is seen as "normal" by representatives of power in school society. In that sense, weak persons always will have to live on conditions decided upon by stronger ones, no matter if this means inclusion, exclusion, integration or segregation. In that perspective the needs of special education are determined from conditions dictated within the framework of regular education (Emanuelsson & Persson, 1996). One consequence is, that special education can be seen as an artefact of regular education (cf. Skrtic, 1995), and obviously responding more clear to regular education needs than to the needs of labelled, diagnosed, and excluded students.

In a school history perspective then, you can see reasons for using the concept integration as a kind of measure taken to certain individuals - to 'integrate them'. It has to do with the above mentioned way of sorting out some children, often already at the age of school start. Some of the beginners were seen as too deviant to be allowed in the regular classes or schools. They instead belonged to special classes or schools. Once established, these classes

very soon became natural, but separated, parts of the school system, and their existence was seldom thought upon as segregation. One reason for this was, that the outspoken aim for organising such special classes, was that of giving special help and support to "children with special needs". The other aim, helping regular classes to get rid of deviant individuals in risk of causing problems and hinders in the planned teaching, was seldom clearly expressed. The segregated classes and schools were so well established, and the segregation in itself a self-evident part of the system, that it was not thought about, and even so among progressive school planning people (Ahlström et al, 1986).

It was not until ca 25 years ago that these circumstances were observed and debated as segregation and challenged as such as a result of demanding policies of normalisation (Emanuelsson, 1985). It is therefore no wonder, that the main questions, then, were connected to thinking about possibilities of *moving* individuals *from* their segregated classes or schools *into* the 'main-stream' and that this trying to move was called 'to integrate' them into regular classes. But anyhow, this use of the concept 'integrate' was unlucky for several reasons. Today you can even see the term integrated as a label given already to new-beginners in school, that is to say on individuals who never have been segregated in the school organisation before. To talk of such school beginners as 'integrated' in contrast to their other class-mates just does not make sense – i.e. just nonsense.

Integration - aim and processes

Integration as an aim instead means challenges to accept more of what is normally existing as part of regular groups and togetherness. This aim would possibly be more clear, if it was expressed as a demand to "try to avoid segregation". Anyhow, it is a challenge for all members in the regular groups, and preconditions for reaching the aim are dependent on everybody taking responsibility for all members of the group. There is need for development of a kind of *collective competence* in an inclusive education setting to make this possible.

Here the concepts inclusion and exclusion instead of integration and segregation can possibly be of help to sort things out, but I am a bit sceptic to the change, anyhow. When will you hear – or is it already heard? – talking about some students as 'the ones included' in the same way as 'the ones integrated'? We must be very careful not to just make a shift in wording, but be very keen on stressing that it has to do with paradigmatic changes in theoretical understanding and in development of better and well integrated strategies for giving necessary support as an integrated part of an inclusive regular education (cf. Skidmore, 1996; Clark, Dyson & Millward, 1995).

The starting point of thinking ought to be the wholeness, the whole group with its diversity in different aspects – *'all* children'. What is really meant by this expression? Are there any exceptions, and if so, what about the consciousness of the definitions of these exceptions? Diversity among group members cause problems, and there are different group processes going on, which risk to cause neglecting, pushing out, exclusion, or segregation of

certain individuals. The challenges for the group, and those responsible for it, are to try to keep the group together, and *to fight against the needs for exclusion and segregation* that turns up. This must be done by a growing preparedness of changing ways of working, of norms and rules, values etc., in order to make it more possible for all members to be fully and wholly partaking in meaningful and developing activities. Of course, there are differences between individuals also in needs of help and support, but this must be dealt with as part of a shared responsibility between all members of the team in charge of the whole group, the special education teachers included. There *is* also need for competent and qualified special education support. Such support must be based on knowledge also from different kinds of handicap research, first hand on knowledge about conditions that risk to lead into difficulties in learning situations. But this must be given as an integrated part of regular work within the wholeness, as support to the school, and not just to certain individuals. For instance, Individual Education Programs (IEP:s) should be planned to meet individual needs. But help and support means then consequences for the whole group and those responsible for it and for what is s going on in regular school work. IEP:s therefore must be planned as part of the common planning of teaching and school work for all in the regular settings. The starting point here for planning is an understanding of the task from seeing a student *in* difficulties instead of a student *with* difficulties. If this is not successfully achieved, it is most important to see this primarily dependent on what happens - or perhaps often more accurate said and even more important - on what *is not happening* in the group. It has to do with development of collective group competence.

This means then, that diversity in e.g. learning abilities in a group will have to be valued as something positive and valuable instead of something wished to get rid of from the group. The understanding of differences in needs of help and support, and the preparedness to let these needs have influence on resource distributions, is therefore an important precondition for integration to develop in a group or a school class. This kind of preparedness and shared responsibility is also necessary prerequisites for real participation for those in need for special support, otherwise more or less excluded, pushed out or isolated.

Real participation also means partaking in both planning and working. Of special interest is working with IEP:s, but of course through the whole process. This must mean more for a 'user' than just working on special tasks decided upon by other people. In order to be real participation, there is need for 'user' partaking in planning, definition of goals, responsibility for own work, as well as in evaluation.

Integration, then, must be understood, studied and evaluated as *processes* within groups, e g school classes etc. Therefore it is misleading and unfortunate, when the concept integration is used more or less as a synonym for placements. Referring of an individual with some disability to a so-called regular group, in fact means forming a new group, which is just the starting point of work on creating and developing integration. This is

the main reason why I think it is so important to use justified terminology, and talk about placement and forming of groups in organisational terms, and keep integration as a concept restricted to mean what it is really meant to mean, namely the ideologically based aims and development processes towards such aims and goals. Instead of nonsense talking about a child as integrated, it is more justified to talk about challenges to keep the group together, which means a fight against segregating wishes and processes. So doing, the aim is to further development of the group into a well-integrated togetherness and working unit - and with everybody fully partaking – which is how I understand inclusive education.

Consequences for future research

This way of thinking has important consequences for research on integration, too. Studies on integration in such a more comprehensive and ideological sense are still too few. This must be an essential challenge for future R&D-work. Not least it is of extreme importance to study the situation in school for pupils that earlier should have been referred to special classes or special schools, but who today are kept in the main-stream in one sense or another. This is not the only important aspect of integration, though, that needs to be better elucidated by research.

There are several studies reported showing results which must be interpreted as signs of unsuccessful integration or inclusive education (e.g. Zigmond et.al., 1995). Most of them, with few exceptions, are still anchored in the psycho-medical paradigm (Skidmore, 1996), in the sense, that they are designed from the perspective of already diagnosed and labelled 'special needs students'. That is, the process of transforming diversity into deviancy taken place in regular and inclusive education settings is already started and taken for granted already when designing the studies, and not put under study as such. This very critical aspect is too often dealt with as unproblematic. In most cases, therefore, the studies have concentrated too much only on often called 'handicapped – with different kinds of diagnosed syndromes and/or impairments – pupils who are integrated'. Very little is said and known about the *integration processes* as such. There are also too few studies on measures taken to try to avoid segregation by furthering better conditions for participation and acceptance also of students in risk of being judged as deviant. To get more knowledge of that kind, you must have studies of a broader design, including process-oriented research on whole groups and educational settings. They also need to be longitudinally designed, as development of integration means development processes over long periods. One critical area which need to be researched is different kinds of needs for having students in difficulties diagnosed and/or labelled related to conditions within the inclusive education as it is performed. This must be done in a broader and further developed paradigm, not just the traditional psycho-medical one, in order to avoid what Skidmore (1996) talk about as limitations of reductionism. It is worthwhile noting, that many studies also done within sociological and organisational paradigms, suffer from the same limitation. Interesting ideas and experiences in such a perspective are presented by Clark et. al. (1995). This I see as a very

important task for future research on integration and user participation within in the field of special education.

If such studies will not be done, the results from other studies will continually risk to be miss-interpreted in a too narrow perspective, which now often is the case. If so, the causes for failures in development of integration and effective inclusive education will still be one-sided laid on individual characteristics and deviancies. If integration - or rather avoiding segregation - is going to be successful or not is dependent on what is done and happens to everybody included in the whole integrated education setting. Not only to what is done to the sometimes called 'user' – the receiver of special support and measures. *Diversity in needs of help and support is firsthand a question of well integrated measures than integration of individuals.* Of course, the needs of compensating help and support related to personal preconditions are mostly the same, and independent of what group you belong to, a matter that now and then tends to be forgotten about, when inclusion or integration is seen as possibilities to save financial and other resources.

Stop talking about 'integrated individuals'
As long as we talk about 'integrated individuals' (e g students, handicapped, deviant persons etc.), this is in itself a sign on how much there still is to be done to improve conditions for real integration - and participation - in school and society. I think it is urgent to stop talking of integration as a kind of measure or method, and definitely to stop using the label 'integrated' on individual persons. The same can be said about the concept 'inclusion'.

Seeing integration as an aim or a goal, we must realise, that it is a social goal in a society. It is decided upon by representatives given power to decide on social policies. In that sense the decisions are taken by persons in powerful positions in society. Persons, with impediments and other preconditions judged as weak or bad, are very seldom in such positions. So-called disabled children, and their parents, can almost never make free choices of their own about placements, in the mainstream or in more or less segregated groups or schools. Therefore, the real preconditions for integration to develop or not are dictated in the so-called normal groups and their way of functioning. These preconditions, and the possibilities for changing such preconditions, must be better studied and understood. This is a very important, but yet to a great deal neglected, task for special education research. We are in big need of results and knowledge from such studies, in order to supplement knowledge from different kinds of handicap research.

This is even more important today, when integration policies are put under debate for both ideological and economic reasons. Some months ago, I heard Seamus Hegarty talk about several threats against the 'comprehensiveness' in the obligatory schools in UK and elsewhere. It is easy to discover such threatening indices also in Sweden, e.g. a recent – decided by parliament – change of the school law. This change means an introduction of a new principle in Swedish obligatory school system. For the first time in the history of obligatory education in this country, beforehand judged

possibilities for individual students to reach certain achievement results are presented as demands for being accepted in the 'grundskola' – still called 'a school for (almost?) all'. Even if the intention behind the change probably not was exclusive – it was one of several changes related to increase possibilities for parents to choose among schools for their children – it is reasonable to think, that it will have such consequences, at least for children diagnosed as mentally retarded.

Here again, you see serious consequences of the careless use of the concept integration. It is often said, that integration has been tried, and proved not successful. A closer look at many situations, and many evaluation study reports included, shows that what has been tried was just a kind of mainstream placement. You see very little or nothing of IEP:s worked out in collaboration with the students themselves, their parents and a working team of school and other experts as part of the planning of the class-room work. You also see very little of student participation in forming individual goals and in responsibility for evaluation. A crucial question is also what kind of learning that is appreciated. Is learning as such positively evaluated? These things are of special importance for those students who become judged to be in need of special help and support. If they have no influence and therefore no possibilities to participate in decision procedures on these matters, they also become set aside in almost everything else that is going on in the group or class. As a consequence, the whole burden for integration to develop is laid on the disabled pupil and a special education teacher, while very little or nothing at all had happened with the preconditions in the mainstream group in which integration was supposed to develop. Therefore you get a wrong picture of the real problem (Emanuelsson & Persson, 1997).

You often see a kind of unholy alliances of opinions held by persons with completely different grounds for their view on 'integration' in policy decisions e.g. for school children with disabilities. Parents and other spokesmen of the interest of these children find it proved that their children have a difficult and bad situation in the regular classes, and they also find support for that opinion in results from too narrowly designed research. But you also see other groups, e. g. spokesmen for the necessity – from an elitist point of view – of raising the level of achievement in regular school classes, and of people not really prepared to meet the challenges of integration as a social aim in school. They find it more comfortable and less threatening to leave the challenging problems to external experts and thereby get rid of the responsibility and apprehended hinders in the planned teaching. Both kinds of groups are united in the wish for more segregated solutions like special classes and/or schools. Such motives and unholy alliances ought to be more carefully scrutinised by research, too.

Some results from a longitudinal study

Finally, I want to refer to some results from a research project in Sweden (Sonnander & Emanuelsson, 1992 and 1993; Sonnander *et al*, , 1993). Within the frame of a longitudinal study, where we follow five representative samples of pupils from grade 6 and onwards, we especially

studied an extreme low ability group. This group, MMR according to IQ-measure criterion (IQ <70), was defined and identified only within the research project, and not in the schools. They all belonged to regular classes, but as they were not identified in schools as mentally retarded, they were not by any officially taken decision 'integrated' either.

The follow-up results were very interesting, and not least so according to user participation aspects. The results show that these not administratively classified mildly mentally retarded pupils are, of course, found among low-achievers in the ordinary school. However, they share their shortcomings with many peers with average test scores. Their transition into the labour market largely follows the pattern of their peers with no upper secondary school experience and was facilitated by various employment measures.

Answers on self concept questionnaire-items show no nameable divergence from their peers in class either. As far as we have been able to see – with needed reservations for not coming very close to the class-room situations in a study of very big samples and some other short-comings in our study – they show a picture of rather successful integration taking place during the ten year of follow up. But what is very interesting with this studied group – and may be one important condition for the rather light result picture – is the fact, that no one in the group ever was officially 'integrated' in their classes. They just belonged. It is a challenging task for further studies to closer scrutinise the conditions and processes in that kind of belonging and partaking, may be characterised by more consciously formed working plans and co-operation than much talk about integration and/or inclusion (See also Ainscow, 1995; Zigmond et. al., 1995).

References

Ahlström, K-G., Emanuelsson, I. & Wallin, E. (1986). *Skolans krav – elevernas behov.* Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Ainscow, M. Special Needs through School Improvement; School Improvement through Special Needs. In C. Clark, A. Dyson & A. Millward (eds.) (1995). *Towards Inclusive Schools?* London: David Fulton Publ., 54-62.

Clark, C., Dyson, A. & Millward, A. (eds.) (1995).*Towards Inclusive Schools?* London: David Fulton Publ., 54-62.

Emanuelsson, I. (1985). *Integration of handicapped pupils in Sweden: Concepts, research experience, present practices.* Paper at a Symposium on handicapped immigrant children and youth. Stockholm: Skolöverstyrelsen.

Emanuelsson, I. (1994). Special Education, History of. The *International Encyclopedia of Education* (2nd ed.). *10*:5658-63. Oxford: Pergamon Press

Emanuelsson, I. (1994). Mainstreaming. The *International Encyclopedia of Education* (2nd ed.). 6:3556-60. Oxford: Pergamon Press

Emanuelsson, I. (1996). *Skolan och normalvariationen.* /School and the normal variation/. Research plan. Göteborg University: Department of Education and Educational Research, 1996-09-06.

Emanuelsson, I. & Persson, B. (1997). Who is considered to be in need of special education? – Why, How and By whom?. Accepted by *Europ. J. Spec. Needs Ed.*

Hegarty, S. (1991). Toward an agenda for research in special education. *Europ. J. Spec. Needs Ed., 6,* 2, 87-99.

Hegarty, S. (1993). Reviewing the literature on integration. *Europ. J. Spec. Needs Ed., 8,* 3, 194-200.

Persson, B. (1995). Specialpedagogiskt arbete i grundskolan. En studie av förutsättningar, genomförande och verksamhetsinriktning. Göteborgs universitet, Institutionen för specialpedagogik, nr 4 (Juni 1995).

Persson, B. (1997). *Who needs special education?* Paper presented at the 1997 Annual AERA Meeting , Chicago, Ill. Göteborg University: Department of Special Education

Skidmore, D. (1996). Towards an integrated theoretical framework for research into special educational needs. *Europ. J. Spec. Needs Ed., 11,* 1, 33-47.

Skrtic, T. (1991). *Behind Special Education. A Critical Analysis of Professional Culture and School Organization.* Denver: Love Publishing Co.

Skrtic, T. (1995) (ed.) *Disability and Democracy. Reconstructing (Special) Education for Postmodernity.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Sonnander, K. & Emanuelsson, I. (1992). Mildly Mentally Retarded Pupils in the Ordinary Swedish School: School Achievement and Employment. Paper presented at the IASSMD World Congress, Brisbane, Australia, 5th-9th August, 1992.

Sonnander, K. & Emanuelsson, I. (1993). Svagbegåvade elever i vanlig skola: skolerfarenheter och inträde på arbetsmarknaden. *Nordisk Tidsskrift for Spesialpedagogikk,* 2/93, 79-88

Sonnander, K. & Emanuelsson, I. (1993). Utvärdering genom uppföljning av elever VIII. Svagbegåvade elevers inträde på arbetsmarknaden. En uppföljningsstudie till 23 års ålder av svagbegåvade elever i vanlig

skola. Högskolan för lärarutbildning, Institutionen för pedagogik - Uppsala universitet, Institutionen för psykiatri

Sonnander, K. Emanuelsson, I. & Kebbon, L. (1993). Pupils With Mild Mental Retardation in Regular Swedish Schools: Prevalence, Objective Characteristics, and Subjective Evaluations. *American Journal on Mental Retardation, 97,* 6, 692-701

Sonnander, K. and Emanuelsson, I. (1993). Mildly mentally retarded pupils in the ordinary Swedish school: School achievement and employment. In J. T. Sandvin & A. F. Fasting (red.), *Intellectual Disability Research. Nordic Contributions.* NF-report nr 16/93, 183-197. Bodø: NordlandsForskning - FUN Nordic Research on Mental Retardation

Zigmond, N. (ed.) (1995). /A special issue on Inclusive Education/*J. Spec. Ed., 29,* 2.